

REMARKS

The Office Action of 07/02/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, which indication is appreciatively acknowledged. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 2, which has been canceled. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are therefore believed to be allowable.

Claim 5 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 7, which has been canceled. Claim 7 was rejected as being unpatentable over Mohindra in view of Garskamp. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration requested.

The wholesale modifications to Monhindra "suggested" by Garskamp would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Rather, Mohindra explicitly teaches away from the solution of Garskamp, which is essentially described at col. 1, lines 44-59 of the present specification.

Furthermore, even assuming that the combination were justified, the resulting combination would still fail to teach or suggest features of the present invention. The rejection states in part: "The same adder can be used for each channel to reduce the number of components needed in the circuit. By doing so, the cathodes of the I-channel and the Q-channel are connected to each other." The fact that two signals may participate in the same summing operation, however, does not result in those signal terminals being "connected."

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1 and 3-6 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 11/02/2007